

REMARKS

The office action of May 5, 2006, has been carefully considered.

It is noted that the abstract of the disclosure, the application and claims 1-19 are objected to for containing various informalities.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over WO 95/27115 to Berggren in view of the patent to Saunders.

Claims 16-19 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

In connection with the Examiner's objections, applicant has deleted the original abstract, attached an Abstract of the Disclosure, and amended the specification and the claims.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted

that the objections to the abstract, the application and the claims are overcome and should be withdrawn.

In view of the Examiner's rejections of the claims, applicant has canceled claim 1, added new claims 20 and 21, and amended claims 2-19.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims now on file particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claim 17 to address the instances of indefiniteness cited by the Examiner.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is overcome and should be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims presently on file differ essentially and in an unobvious, highly advantageous manner from the constructions disclosed in the references.

Turning now to the references and particularly to Berggren, it can be seen that this reference discloses a mechanism for

locking lids. Although Berggren discloses elastic parts 13, 14, these only form a flexible connection between the rigid bars 10, 11 and the rotor 12. The elastic parts are not components of a longitudinally movable locking bar. Berggren thus does not disclose a locking bar that has a flexible inner section and a rigid outer remaining section, as in the presently claimed invention. The elastic parts 13, 14 are not deformable as in the presently claimed invention. Furthermore there is no course that is tangential to the curvature, as in the presently claimed invention.

The patent to Saunders discloses a door lock system. Saunders does not teach a flexible inner section. Thus a deforming of the inner section is not possible, as in the presently claimed invention. Saunders teaches a link 58 between a vertical first bar and a second horizontal bar, and connected to these by rotatable links. The link 58 is a rigid member and is thus the opposite of the claimed flexible bar section of the present invention.

Although Saunders teaches different channel parts, he does not teach a first, curved course essentially coaxial to the axis of rotation of the rotor, and a linear second course extending from and running tangential to the curvature of the first course,

as in the present invention.

The curvature in one wall of Saunders is only for the purpose of providing room for a pivot of the link 58. Due to the rigidity of the link there is no way it can be formed into a ring segment. The link 58 is always rigid.

The Examiner combined Berggren with Saunders in determining that claims 1-15 would be unpatentable over such a combination. Applicant respectfully submits that neither of these references, nor their combination, teach a lock having a locking bar with a flexible inner section and a rigid outer remaining section, a longitudinal guide for the locking bar, which longitudinal guide is configured to deform the flexible section of the locking bar during longitudinal movement of the bar, as in the presently claimed invention. The combination further does not teach a longitudinal guide having a first, curved course essentially coaxial to the axis of rotation of the rotor, and a linear second course extending from and running tangential to the curvature of the first course, wherein the first course accommodates the flexible section and forms the flexible section into a ring segment that is coaxial to the axis of rotation of the rotor, and the second course stretches and stiffens the

BM-161

flexible section in order to transfer a force load from the rotor to the remaining section of the locking bar, as in the presently claimed invention.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over a combination of the above-discussed references is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Any additional fees or charges required at this time in connection with this application may be charged to Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 11-1835.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Klaus P. Stoffel
Reg. No. 31,668

For: Friedrich Kueffner

Reg. No. 29,482
317 Madison Avenue, Suite 910
New York, New York 10017
(212) 986-3114

BM-161

Dated: September 5, 2006

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on September 5, 2006.

By:


Klaus P. Stoffel

Date: September 5, 2006